



C.M.A(MD)Nos. 101, 102, 103, 109, 136, 140, 332 and 361 of 2026

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

RESERVED ON: 10.03.2026, 13.03.2026, 15.03.2026

PRONOUNCED ON:02.04.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

**C.M.A(MD)Nos. 101, 102, 103, 109, 136, 140, 332 and 361 of 2026
and**

C.M.P.(MD)Nos.1074, 1069, 1068, 1151, and 1334 of 2026

C.M.A(MD)No.101 of 2026:

Hemathkumar : Appellant/Petitioner/Defendant

Vs.

1.A.Padmini

2.G.Pangajavalli

: Respondents / Respondents/
Plaintiffs

PRAYER:- Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is filed under Order 43 Rule (1) (c) C.P.C., against the fair and decreetal order, dated 02.09.2021 in I.A.No.2 of 2019, in O.S.No.76 of 2011, on the file of II Additional District Court, Tiruchirappalli.

For Appellant : Mr.B.Prasanna Vinoth

For Respondents :Mr.D.Kirubakaran



C.M.A(MD)Nos. 101, 102, 103, 109, 136, 140, 332 and 361 of 2026

C.M.A(MD)No.102 of 2026:

WEB COPY

C.John Justin

: Appellant/Petitioner/Defendant

Vs.

Krishnavaga Benefit Fund Ltd.,
represented by its Managing Director,
A.Kolappa Pillai.

: Respondent / Respondent/
Plaintiff

PRAYER:- Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is filed under Order 43 Rule (1) (c) C.P.C., against the fair and decreetal order, dated 19.09.2022 in I.A.No.3 of 2021, in O.S.No.175 of 2018, on the file of the Principal District Judge, Kanyakumari at Nagercoil.

For Appellant : Mr.M.R.Sreenivasan

For Respondent :Mr.G.Aravindan

C.M.A(MD)No.103 of 2026:

Rajarethinam

: Appellant/Petitioner/Defendant

Vs.

T.Suresh

: Respondent / Respondent/
Plaintiff

PRAYER:- Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is filed under Order 43 Rule (1) (c) C.P.C., against the fair and Ex-order, made in I.A.No.1 of 2023, in



C.M.A(MD)Nos. 101, 102, 103, 109, 136, 140, 332 and 361 of 2026

O.S.No.87 of 2021, dated 11.01.2024, on the file of the Principal District Judge, Kanyakumari at Nagercoil.

For Appellant : Mr.M.Arikaran

For Respondent :No Appearance

C.M.A(MD)No.109 of 2026:

1.R.Jeyachitra

2.Ramu @ Raman : Appellants/Petitioners/Defendants

Vs.

A.Govindarajan : Respondent /Respondent/Plaintiff

PRAYER:- Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is filed under Order 43 Rule (1) (c) C.P.C., against the fair and decretal order, dated 09.01.2023 in I.A.No.164 of 2021, in O.S.No.110 of 2018, on the file of the Principal District Court, Dindigul.

For Appellants : Mr.S.Sankar

For Respondent :Mr.K.Muraleedharan

C.M.A(MD)No.136 of 2026:

V.Jain Sherly : Appellant/Petitioner/Plaintiff

Vs.

A.Thinagar : Respondent /Respondent/Defendant



C.M.A(MD)Nos. 101, 102, 103, 109, 136, 140, 332 and 361 of 2026

WEB COPY

PRAYER:- Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is filed under Order 43 Rule (1) (c) C.P.C., against the fair and decreetal order, dated 06.06.2023 in I.A.No.2 of 2022, in O.S.No.112 of 2012, on the file of the Principal District Judge, Kanyakumari.

For Appellant : Mr.R.Balakrishnan

For Respondent :No Appearance

C.M.A(MD)No.140 of 2026:

S.Duraisamy : Appellant/Petitioner/1st Defendant

Vs.

1.M.Pasupathi

2.K.Manivel

3.T.Palanisamy

: Respondents /Respondents/Plaintiffs

PRAYER:- Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is filed under Order 43 Rule (1) (c) C.P.C., against the fair and decreetal order, dated 27.04.2023 in I.A.No.3 of 2023, in O.S.No.16 of 2019, on the file of the Principal District Court, Karur.

For Appellant : Mr.V.Nagarajan

For Respondents :Mr.P.Santhana Krishnan



C.M.A(MD)Nos. 101, 102, 103, 109, 136, 140, 332 and 361 of 2026

C.M.A(MD)No.332 of 2026:

WEB COPY

1.Vijayalakshmi
2.Siva
3.Prabu

: Appellants/Petitioners/Plaintiffs

Vs.

1.Anthoniyamma;
2.Gunasekar

3.The Sub Registrar,
Budhalur,
Budhalur Taluk Office,
Budhalur.

4.The Tahsildar,
Budhalur Taluk Office,
Budhalur.

5.The District Collector,
Office of the District Collectorate,
Thanjavur. : Respondents /Respondents/Defendants

PRAYER:- Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is filed under Order 43 Rule (1) (c) C.P.C., against the fair and decreetal order, dated 24.10.2025 passed in I.A.No.626 of 2023, in O.S.No.96 of 2009, on the file of the District Munsif, Thiruvaiyaru.

For Appellants : Mr.S.Raja



C.M.A(MD)Nos. 101, 102, 103, 109, 136, 140, 332 and 361 of 2026

C.M.A(MD)No.361 of 2026:

WEB COPY

M.Senthilkumar : Petitioner/Petitioner

Vs.

M.Santhana Krishnan : Respondent /Respondent

PRAYER:- Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is filed under Order 43 Rule (1) (c) C.P.C., against the fair and decreetal order, dated 30.01.2025 in I.A.No.1339 of 2023, in unnumbered A.S.No. of 2023, on the file of the Principal District Judge, Madurai.

For Appellant : Mr.S.Samuel James Devasagayam

COMMON ORDER

These Civil Miscellaneous Appeals are directed against the orders passed by the Courts below dismissing (i) the petitions filed under Section 5 of the Indian Limitation Act seeking condonation of delay in filing applications for setting aside the exparte decree under Order IX Rule 13 C.P.C. for restoring the suit which was dismissed for default under Order IX Rule 9 C.P.C., and (ii) the petitions filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act to condone the delay in preferring the appeals.



C.M.A(MD)Nos. 101, 102, 103, 109, 136, 140, 332 and 361 of 2026

2. Except the appellants in C.M.A.(MD)Nos.332 of 2026 and 361 of 2026, the appellants in other appeals originally filed the Civil Revision Petitions challenging the dismissal of the petitions filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act.

3. The learned Counsel for the appellants would submit that this Court, relying upon the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the ***Koushik Mutually Aided Co-operative Housing Society Vs. Ameena and another (2023 INSC 1065)*** had observed that the Civil Revision Petitions were not maintainable and on that basis directed the Registry to re-register the Civil Revision Petitions as Civil Miscellaneous Appeals and in pursuance of the said directions, the Civil Revision Petitions came to be converted into Civil Miscellaneous Appeals. They would further contend that an order dismissing the petition filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act is not an appealable order and that an appeal would lie only against the dismissal or rejection of a petition filed under Order IX Rule 13 C.P.C., or under Order IX Rule 9 C.P.C., and that there is no merger of the order dismissing the petition filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act with any consequential order of rejection in the petition filed under Order IX Rule 13 C.P.C., or under Order IX Rule 9 C.P.C.



C.M.A(MD)Nos. 101, 102, 103, 109, 136, 140, 332 and 361 of 2026

WEB COPY

4. The learned Counsel would place reliance on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***C.Prabhakar Rao and another Vs. Sama Mahipal Reddy and another*** reported in ***2025 SCC Online 495***. In the said case, the plaintiffs had obtained an exparte decree in a suit for specific performance, based on an agreement for sale. The defendants thereafter filed an application for setting aside the exparte decree along with a petition under Section 5 of the Limitation Act to condone the delay in filing such application for setting aside the exparte decree. The trial Court declined to condone the delay and consequently dismissed the application filed under Order IX Rule 13 C.P.C., for setting aside the exparte decree. The defendants filed a revision challenging the order refusing to condone the delay and the High Court, while condoning the delay, proceeded to set aside the exparte decree and restored the suit for further hearing. When that order was challenged, the Hon'ble Apex Court has dealt with the scope of the petition filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act to condone the delay vis-a-vis the application for setting aside the exparte decrees and the relevant passage is extracted hereunder:



WEB COPY



C.M.A(MD)Nos. 101, 102, 103, 109, 136, 140, 332 and 361 of 2026

“11. To start with, facts and events relating to passing of an ex-parte decree are distinct from the facts and events relating to the delayed filing of the application for setting aside of the ex-parte decree. Secondly, the procedure for setting aside the ex-parte decree will again be distinct from the procedure for condoning the delayed filing of the application to set aside the ex-parte decree. Thirdly, the adjudication and determination of a court with respect to setting aside the ex-parte decree are independent of the adjudication with respect to condoning the delay. Finally, the remedies against these orders are independent and one remedy would not subsume the other. They must be adopted and pursued independently. This much of clarity is sufficiently borne by our practice and procedure of law. The order passed by the High Court setting aside the ex-parte decree when no revision is filed against the said order of the Trial Court in I.A. No. 1163 of 2021 cannot be sustained.”

5. The Hon’ble Apex Court has categorically held that the scope of a petition filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act and that of an application filed under Order IX Rule 13 C.P.C. are entirely distinct. It has further been observed that the adjudication and determination of both petitions are independent, and the remedies available against the orders passed therein are also separate and independent. One remedy does not



C.M.A(MD)Nos. 101, 102, 103, 109, 136, 140, 332 and 361 of 2026

subsume the other, and each must be pursued in accordance with law. As rightly contended by the learned counsel for the appellants, the Hon'ble Apex Court has, in effect, clarified that there is no merger of an order dismissing a petition for condonation of delay with the order rejecting or dismissing the application for setting aside the ex parte decree, and that both orders stand on independent footing.

6. It is pertinent to note that an order dismissing an application for condonation of delay is not a decree, but only a procedural order, which is revisable and not appealable. On the other hand, an order rejecting an application for setting aside an ex parte decree is an appealable order under Order XLIII Rule 1(d) C.P.C. Ordinarily, when a petition filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act is dismissed, the application filed under Order IX Rule 13 C.P.C. or under Order IX Rule 9 C.P.C., whether numbered or otherwise, is consequently rejected or closed. Whatever be the form of such consequential order, the substantive order remains the dismissal of the petition for condonation of delay, which is neither a decree nor an appealable order. Therefore, the appropriate remedy would be by way of a Civil Revision Petition under Section 115 C.P.C. In view of the above, the Civil Miscellaneous Appeals challenging the dismissal



C.M.A(MD)Nos. 101, 102, 103, 109, 136, 140, 332 and 361 of 2026

of the petitions filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act are not maintainable in law.

7. In C.M.A.(MD)Nos.332 of 2026 and 361 of 2026, the learned Counsel for the appellants would submit that in compliance with the directions of the Registry, the matters were filed as Civil Miscellaneous Appeals and that the said appeals may now be directed to be converted as Civil Revision Petitions.

8. In view of the above, the Registry is directed to convert the Civil Miscellaneous Appeals into Civil Revision Petitions within a period of ten days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The Registry is further directed to refund the excess Court fee if any paid on the Civil Miscellaneous Appeals to the appellants.

02.04.2026

Index : Yes : No
Internet : Yes : No
NCC : Yes : No

SSL

11/12



WEB COPY



C.M.A(MD)Nos. 101, 102, 103, 109, 136, 140, 332 and 361 of 2026

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

SSL

PRE-DELIVERY JUDGMENT MADE IN

C.M.A(MD)Nos. 101, 102, 103, 109, 136, 140, 332 and 361 of 2026

02.04.2026